



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/274,014	03/22/99	VOUTE	N 9676-286

PENNIE & EDMONDS  
1667 K STREET N W  
WASHINGTON DC 20006

IM22/0518

EXAMINER	
SORKIN, D	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1723	9
DATE MAILED: 05/18/00	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/274,014	VOUTE ET AL.
	Examiner David L. Sorkin	Art Unit 1723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

**Status**

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2000.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) Claim(s) 1-66 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23-58 and 64-66 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 and 59-63 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been:
    1. received.
    2. received in Application No. (Series Code / Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. & 119(e).

**Attachment(s)**

14) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	17) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
15) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	18) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
16) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6 .	19) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 1723

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Objections***

1. Claim 13 is objected to because of the following informalities: "nucleic acid" should read – polynucleic acid--. Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1- 10, 13-22, and 59-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr et al. (US 5,015,373).

4. Claim 1: Carr et al. ('373) discloses dense mineral oxide solid supports comprising a mineral oxide matrix and an interactive polymer network which is rooted in pores and on the surface of the mineral oxide matrix (see abstract). The lowest porosity explicitly disclosed is 31%, which occurs at a sintering temperature of 900 degrees. It is considered that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have made the porosity <30%. Carr et al. ('373) discloses the "the surface area and pore volume decrease with increasing firing temperature" (col. 13, lines 37-39) and also that the sintering temperature can range from 100-1500 degrees (col. 8, lines 20-29). This would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art to decrease the porosity below 30%.

Art Unit: 1723

5. Claim 2: The supports of Carr et al. ('373) are discussed above with respect to claim 1. Carr et al. fails to explicitly disclose a density of 1.7-11, however because the supports of Carr et al. are zirconium oxide (see col. 13), it is considered that the density would intrinsically be in this range if the porosity is less than <30%, because zero porosity zirconium oxide has a density of 5.9.

6. Claim 3: The supports of Carr et al. ('373) are discussed above with respect to claim 2. Carr et. al. ('373) fails to explicitly disclose a density of 2.1-10, however because the supports of Carr et al. ('373) are zirconium oxide (see col. 13), it is considered that the density would intrinsically be in this range if the porosity is less than <30%, because zero porosity zirconium oxide has a density of 5.9.

7. Claim 4: The supports of Carr et al. ('373), discussed above with respect to claim 1, are in the 5-500 micron range (col. 4, lines 40-45).

8. Claim 5: The supports of Carr et al. ('373), discussed above with respect to claim 4, are in the 10-100 micron range (col. 4, lines 40-45).

9. Claim 7: The supports of Carr et al. ('373) are discussed above with respect to claim 1. The lowest porosity explicitly disclosed is 31%, which occurs at a sintering temperature of 900 degrees. It is consider that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have made the porosity between 5 and 25%. Carr et al. ('373) discloses the "the surface area and pore volume decrease with increasing firing temperature" (col. 13, lines 37-39) and also that the sintering temperature can range

Art Unit: 1723

from 100-1500 degrees (col. 8, lines 20-29). This would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art to decrease the porosity between 5 and 25%.

10. Claim 8: The supports of Carr et al. ('373) are discussed above with respect to claim 7. The lowest porosity explicitly disclosed is 31%, which occurs at a sintering temperature of 900 degrees. It is considered that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have made the porosity between 5 and 15%. Carr et al. ('373) discloses the "the surface area and pore volume decrease with increasing firing temperature" (col. 13, lines 37-39) and also that the sintering temperature can range from 100-1500 degrees (col. 8, lines 20-29). This would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art to decrease the porosity between 5 and 15%.

11. Claim 9: The supports of Carr et al. ('373), discussed above with respect to claim 1, comprise zirconia (see col. 13).

12. Claim 10: In the supports of Carr et al. ('373), discussed above with respect to claim 1, the polymer network comprises a soluble organic polymer crosslinked in place with the mineral oxide matrix (see col. 27, lines 1-50).

13. Claim 13: In the supports of Carr et al. ('373), discussed above with respect to claim 10, the polymer is disclosed to be polyvinyl alcohol (col. 8, lines 60-68).

14. Claim 14: In the supports of Carr et al. ('373), discussed above with respect to claim 1, the polymer network comprises monomers copolymerized in place with the mineral oxide matrix (col. 8, lines 59-68).

Art Unit: 1723

15. Claims 15-22: The monomers of Carr et al. ('373), discussed above with respect to claim 14 include vinylpyrrolidone (col. 65). (Note: the monomer being vinylpyrrolidone is within the claim boundary of each of claims 15-22).

16. Claim 59: The supports of Carr et al. ('373), discussed above with respect to claim 2, are in the 5-500 micron range (col. 4, lines 40-45).

17. Claim 6: Carr et al. ('373) discloses dense mineral oxide solid supports comprising a mineral oxide matrix and an interactive polymer network which is rooted in pores and on the surface of the mineral oxide matrix (see abstract). The supports are in the 10-100 micron range (col. 4, lines 40-45). The lowest porosity explicitly disclosed is 31%, which occurs at a sintering temperature of 900 degrees. It is considered that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have made the porosity <30%. Carr et al. ('373) discloses the "the surface area and pore volume decrease with increasing firing temperature" (col. 13, lines 37-39) and also that the sintering temperature can range from 100-1500 degrees (col. 8, lines 20-29). This would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art to decrease the porosity below 30%. Carr et al. ('373) fails to explicitly disclose a density of 2.1-11, however because the supports of Carr et al. ('373) are zirconium oxide (see col. 13), it is considered that the density would intrinsically be in this range if the porosity is less than <30%, because zero porosity zirconium oxide has a density of 5.9.

18. Claim 60: The supports of Carr et al. ('373) are discussed above with respect to claim 6. The lowest porosity explicitly disclosed is 31%, which occurs at a sintering

Art Unit: 1723

temperature of 900 degrees. It is considered that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have made the porosity between 5 and 25%. Carr et al. ('373) discloses the "the surface area and pore volume decrease with increasing firing temperature" (col. 13, lines 37-39) and also that the sintering temperature can range from 100-1500 degrees (col. 8, lines 20-29). This would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art to decrease the porosity between 5 and 25%.

19. Claim 61: The supports of Carr et al. ('373), discussed above with respect to claim 6, comprise zirconia (see col. 13).
20. Claim 62: In the supports of Carr et al. ('373), discussed above with respect to claim 6, the polymer network comprises a soluble organic polymer crosslinked in place with the mineral oxide matrix (see col. 27, lines 1-50).
21. Claim 63: In the supports of Carr et al. ('373), discussed above with respect to claim 6, the polymer network comprises monomers copolymerized in place with the mineral oxide matrix (col. 8, lines 59-68).
22. Claims 11-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carr et al. ('373) in view of Girot et al. (US 5,445,732).
23. Claims 11-12: The supports of Carr et al. ('373) are discussed above with respect to claim 10. The soluble organic polymer fails to be a polysaccharide. Girot et al. ('732) teaches polysaccharides including cellulose derivatives (col. 17, lines 2-3). It is considered that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have utilized a polysaccharide, and specifically a cellulose derivative, as the polymer of Carr et

Art Unit: 1723

al. ('373), because Girot et al. ('732) also uses the polymers to coat inorganic matrices (col. 5), and Carr et al. ('373) discloses the use of many alternative polymers (col. 8, lines 59-68).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David L. Sorkin whose telephone number is 703-308-1121. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 - 5:00 Mon.-Thur., Alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda L. Walker can be reached on 703-308-0457. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7718 for regular communications and 703-305-3599 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.



David Sorkin

May 9, 2000



W. L. WALKER

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700